

Integrating Logic Models and Work Plans

There are two primary program planning tools that DASH-funded partners can develop and review to understand their program's implementation — logic models and work plans. This brief will define logic models and work plans and the interrelationship between the two (see Table 1 on page 2); suggest how grantees can visually link these two; and explain why linking them is beneficial. Program planning is the foundation of good evaluation because it determines what objectives a program intends to accomplish, determines how these objectives will be accomplished, and provides ways to measure their accomplishment.

Definitions

A **logic model** (LM) is a pictorial diagram that shows the relationship between program inputs and activities, outputs, and outcomes of those activities, as well as the overall program goal. It is a visual way to present and share your understanding of the relationships among the resources you have to operate your program, the activities you plan to conduct, and the outputs and outcomes you hope to achieve. Logic models can present an overview of an entire program, specific activities and initiatives, or both. At the beginning of their projects, most DASH-funded partners create a logic model that provides an overview of the entire program.

A **work plan** (WP) is the program coordinator's detailed road map for running the program in a given budget period. The recommended format of the work plan includes program goals and objectives, a rationale for program objectives, how the accomplishment of program objectives will be measured, what data sources will be used to measure the accomplishment of program objectives, who is responsible for gathering those data, who is responsible for accomplishing the program objectives, what activities will be conducted to support the program objectives, who is responsible for conducting each activity, and the time line to complete each activity.

Similarities and Differences Between a Logic Model and Work Plan

Although there is some overlap between logic models and work plans, their differences are important. An LM illustrates the presumed *effects* of completing the planned activities. In contrast, the WP is the project coordinator's guide to running the program. The LM gives an overarching, long-term view of the program and goals. The WP walks the user through the specific, annual program goals and objectives, list of activities, program time line, and an outline of what particular *people need to do* to implement the program. Sample implementation activities include conducting trainings, distributing evaluation forms to participants after the trainings, completing follow-up trainings, and writing annual reports on training activities.

Table 1 on the next page shows how the LM and WP are related and which components of each are similar and different. For example, a short-term outcome in an LM might be "high school staff trained on HIV prevention by cadre of health educators". This short-term outcome of professional development for high school staff is reflected in the WP and would be written as a SMART objective — for example, "In the next year, the cadre of health educators will provide professional development on HIV prevention to 150 high school staff members".

Accomplishing this short-term outcome is, in turn, made possible by achieving the corresponding LM output – for example, all members of the cadre of health educators are trained on up-to-date HIV prevention information”. This output is reflected in the measure of accomplishment in the WP. Use Table 1 to see how the LM and WP are related to each other and how you can use both for program planning, implementation, and monitoring.

Need for Periodic Review and Linkage

If project coordinators do not have a logic model to guide their work, they may have trouble charting a road map for their program. You should review both the LM and WP each year to ensure they reflect each other and your actual program goals and objectives. For instance, perhaps you have decided not to work this year on some activities that were originally listed in the logic model; perhaps you have never worked on them and do not plan to do so in the future. If so, these activities should be removed from the logic model. On the other hand, you might have added new activities to your work plan, that also need to be

added to the logic model. Finally, if activities have been completed in the work plan, you should ask yourself if they should now be included as inputs in your logic model. To ensure their utility as planning tools, it is important to periodically compare logic models and work plans.

To show the association between the parts of logic models and work plans, sections can be linked by color. For instance, resources, activities, and outputs pertaining to training in the LM can be highlighted in the same color as the corresponding components in the WP. Examples of these components include goals and objectives, the rationale for the objectives, measures of accomplishment, data sources to measure accomplishments, and primary person(s) responsible for gathering data and accomplishing the objectives.

Having and using both of these evaluation tools will help you ensure that your program remains on target and reaches its goals.

Table 1. Similarities Between Components of the Logic Model and the Work Plan

Logic Model Components	Work Plan Components
Goals and intermediate and long-term outcomes	Program goals
Short-term outcomes	Objectives
Logical links between activities and intended outcomes	Rationales for the objectives
Outputs	Measures of accomplishments
	People responsible for data and objectives
Data sources for outputs and outcomes that allow you to document and track the accomplishments of your program	Data sources to measure accomplishments
Activities	Activities in support of the objectives
	People responsible for activities
	Activity time lines